

Noted
WVB

S E C R E T

16 MAR 1973

Noted
REG

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Career Service Structure

25X1 1. Mr. Colby met on 14 March 1973 with Mr. Broe and the group assigned to study the Career Service Structure, namely Mssrs. [] Bavis, [] Mr. Colby discussed the context within which questions about the career service structure have been raised. He noted that inquiries now going forward in O/TR and O/P might affect the direction of our study since many questions intersect. He stated that no specific questions, problems or objectives could be formulated for the study at this point. He recognized that a general review could easily take six months but implied that we would be able to shape an inquiry which would take considerably less. He ended by stating that we should prepare an outline which he would then discuss and set the final terms of reference for the study. We are all groping, he said, and there is no point in producing a study which will not answer his needs.

25X1

2. In general, we are groping for a new look at handling personnel responsibilities. In the end we may find that the present Career Service structure is basically good, but we must look at the potential attendant on breaking down walls between the major career services (read directorates and pieces thereof). A comprehensive question, therefore, is whether the present structure furthers and encourages or, prevents and discourages the development, advancement or assignment of employees, and whether they are treated equitably within it. I always read this kind of statement to mean, in the interests of the agency, but that this includes morale as it affects performance and the retention of personnel.

3. Beyond the more modest possibility of breaking down some walls, we are directed to inquire into possible new structures which might be more effective in handling personnel responsibilities. Mr. Colby suggested, as an example, that we could classify personnel in new ways to identify them for functions performed more or less throughout the agency. One

25X1

S E C R E T

S E C R E T

arrangement might be general categories, e.g., case officers (?), technicians, reports, and secretarial. Any such general arrangement would also require some separate groups of specialists, such as communicators. Another arrangement could include geographic specialists, e.g., those competent on Africa, Asia, etc., who again are required in more than one directorate.

4. Mr. Colby talked about the impact of the career service structure upon personnel management. It has been generally accepted, he said, that the handling of personnel is defined by the career service; that the structure keeps people where they start; and that too early a decision about a career service may affect the future adversely. This being the case, the question arises as to whether there is an adequate and effective means for moving people who should be moved. Mr. Colby cited a number of liabilities thus placed at the door of the current structure. For example, the several services apply different standards (grades) for similar activities; some offices offer more opportunities for advancement than others; and decisions about personnel are made within too narrow limits.

5. The DCI, Mr. Colby said, believes there should be only one career service, namely, the Agency's; that there should be one institution with one mission working for the President. At this point, the Director apparently believes that the agency's several career services reflect different institutions with different missions and lives of their own. Consequently, he appears to believe that agency employees have worked too long in narrow jobs and now perform their functions too routinely. There is, therefore, a need to move employees about to expand their perspective, to keep them focused on the single mission of the agency, and to bring freshness to their work.

6. Mr. Colby raised a question with regard to advancement. The main way up, with rare exception, is through management, and this is through the chain of command. Some offices offer few opportunities for such advancement; and some professionals do not wish to be managers or would not be good ones. To the extent that the present structure forces higher grades and recognition to coincide with management positions, it should be questioned. The situation exists, at least in part however, because the Office of Personnel has not used the means available to classify professional jobs at higher grades.